

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 7, 20, and 39 stand rejected. Claims 8-13, 21-26, and 40-45 are objected to. Claims 1-6, 14-19, and 27-38 are allowed. Herein, no Claim has been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-45 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 7, 20, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereafter AAPA) in view of Hansen et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0089964 (hereafter Hansen). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 7 recites:

A method of diagramming a network having a plurality of devices, comprising the steps of:

- a) determining a plurality of hierarchical layers for said network, wherein said devices are arranged in said hierarchical layers;
- b) determining one or more groups in each hierarchical layer, wherein ***each group includes at least one device***; and
- c) forming a multi-layered cross-sectional diagram corresponding to said network, wherein ***said multi-layered cross-sectional diagram has a plurality of cross-sectional representations*** which are similar to each other, wherein said plurality of cross-sectional representations have a plurality of sizes, and wherein ***each cross-sectional representation is adapted to visually represent a group from a***

hierarchical layer and is adapted to visually represent one or more other groups from another hierarchical layer. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of AAPA and Hansen does not teach, suggest, or motivate the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 7. In particular, the Independent Claim 7 recites the limitations, "wherein ***each group includes at least one device,***" (emphasis added) "***said multi-layered cross-sectional diagram has a plurality of cross-sectional representations,***" (emphasis added) and, "***each cross-sectional representation is adapted to visually represent a group from a hierarchical layer and is adapted to visually represent one or more other groups from another hierarchical layer***" (emphasis added). Moreover, in the Office Action it is stated that the AAPA fails to disclose the cited limitations but refers to Hansen as disclosing the cited limitations. On page 3 of the Office Action, peer group A1 and peer group B2 (there is no peer group A2) of Hansen's Figure 7 are identified as "cross-sectional representations". Further, at page 4 of the Office Action, it is stated that higher level peer group A1 is adapted to visually represent a group in a hierarchical peer group A.2 and is stated that higher level peer group A1 is adapted to visually represent a hierarchical peer group A.3 from another hierarchical layer.

However, Hansen discloses that peer groups A1 and B2 are divided into lower level peer groups A.1 to A.3 and B.4 to B.5, respectively. [Hansen; Figures

4 and 7; paragraph 0036]. Further, Figures 4 and 7 show that lower level peer groups A.1 to A.3 and B.4 to B.5 have various types of switches (e.g., ordinary and anchor) instead of being divided into further lower level peer groups. Thus, A.1 to A.3 are groups at the same hierarchical level, which is lower than the hierarchical level associated with peer group A1.

The discussion "higher level peer group A1 is adapted to visually represent a group in a hierarchical peer group A.2" fails to disclose the limitation "***each cross-sectional representation is adapted to visually represent a group from a hierarchical layer,***" of Independent Claim 7. The peer group A1 is identified as the "cross-sectional representation" in the Office Action. The peer group A.2 (as well as peer groups A.1 and A.3) has devices (switches) instead of subgroups. As stated above, Independent Claim 7 has the limitation, "***each group includes at least one device,***" (emphasis added). Thus, peer group A.2 is a "group" in a lower hierarchical layer than the hierarchical layer associated with peer group A1 instead of being a "hierarchical layer".

Continuing, the discussion "higher level peer group A1 is adapted to visually represent a hierarchical peer group A.3 from another hierarchical layer" fails to disclose the limitation "***each cross-sectional representation...is adapted to visually represent one or more other groups from another hierarchical layer,***" of Independent Claim 7. The peer group A1 is identified as

the "cross-sectional representation" in the Office Action. As stated above, peer groups A.1 to A.3 are groups at the same hierarchical layer instead of being peer groups from different hierarchical layers. Thus, neither peer group A.1 nor peer group A.3 is from another hierarchical layer, as in the invention of Independent Claim 7.

As described above, the combination of AAPA and Hansen does not teach, suggest, or motivate the cited claim limitations of Independent Claim 7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 7 is patentable over the combination of AAPA and Hansen and is in condition for allowance.

The objected Dependent Claims 8-13 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 7, which is allowable over the combination of AAPA and Hansen. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the objected Dependent Claims 8-13 are patentable over the combination of AAPA and Hansen for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 20 and 39, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 20 and 39 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 7. In particular, Independent Claims 20 and 39 recite the limitations, "wherein ***each group includes at least one device***," (emphasis added), "***said***

multi-layered cross-sectional diagram has a plurality of cross-sectional representations" (emphasis added), and "***each cross-sectional representation is adapted to visually represent a group from a hierarchical layer and is adapted to visually represent one or more other groups from another hierarchical layer***" (emphasis added). The combination of AAPA and Hansen does not teach, suggest, or motivate the cited claim limitations of Independent Claims 20 and 39. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 20 and 39 are patentable over the combination of AAPA and Hansen and are in condition for allowance for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 7.

The objected Dependent Claims 21-26 and the objected Dependent Claims 40-45 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 20 and 39 respectively, which are allowable over the combination of AAPA and Hansen. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the objected Dependent Claims 21-26 and the objected Dependent Claims 40-45 are patentable over the combination of AAPA and Hansen for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-45) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-45) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: _____

11/23/2005

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060